



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,493	06/08/2005	Mark Geach	613-93	8630
7590 03/11/2011				
Dr Mark Geach 104 West Grande Avenue Escondido, CA 92025			EXAMINER LEITH, PATRICIA A	
			ART UNIT 1655	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/11/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10524493	6/8/2005	GEACH, MARK	613-93

Dr Mark Geach  
104 West Grande Avenue  
Escondido, CA 92025

EXAMINER

PATRICIA A. LEITH

ART UNIT	PAPER
1655	20110309

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

Commissioner for Patents

This is an addendum to the Notice of Abandonment in 10/524,493:

Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal on 7/28/2010. The only proper response after the period of response to the Final Office Action is expired and subsequent to the Notice of Appeal is the filing of an Appeal Brief. An Appeal Brief was not filed in this case within the allotted time frame. The Inventor of this case filed a response on 9/29/2010. However, at this time, the Applicant had an Attorney. Therefore, at this time although the Inventor filed a response 1) cross-communication between Inventor and Examiner is not permitted and moreover 2) even if the Examiner considered the Inventor's response considering that ex post facto, the Inventor is now a pro-se Applicant, the response was not a proper response to the Final Office action because said response was filed after the statutory time limit set for the Final Rejection. Hence, the only proper response which could have been made at that time; i.e., 6 months after the Final Rejection and after the filing of a Notice of Appeal was the filing of a proper Appeal Brief. Hence, Inventor's reply is moot and not considered and is not a proper reply and this case is Abandoned.

/PATRICIA A LEITH/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655